UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 13 - 662 - RS
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Howard Webber, et al. Defendant.	UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT NORTHERN U.S. O. W. C.
	「何にたべた」
Speedy Trial Act from Nov. 20, 2013 by the continuance outweigh the best interest	to <u>Occuber 3</u> , 2013, the Court excludes time units to <u>Occuber 3</u> , 2013 and finds that the ends of justice structured of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)	would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. (i).
defendants, the nature of law, that it is unreasonable to	omplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of f the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial ablished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, e of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (iv).
	would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time tion, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (iv).
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 11-20-13	JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED:	Assistant United States Attorney